

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24, 38, 40, 41, and 44-47 are presently active in this case, Claims 1, 7-9, and 38 having been amended and Claims 45-47 having been added by way of the present Amendment.

Claims 2-6, 10-24, 40, and 41 have been allowed.

Claims 7 and 9 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Claims 7 and 9 have been rewritten in independent form, and thus are in condition for allowance.

The Applicant respectfully requests acknowledgement of the receipt and consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on July 14, 2000, and May 15, 2002.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 1, 8, 38, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Maekawara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,121,993). For the reasons discussed below, the Applicant requests the withdrawal of the anticipatory rejection.

In the Office Action, the Maekawara et al. reference is indicated as anticipating each of Claims 1, 8, 38, and 44. However, the Applicant notes that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claims is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). As will be demonstrated below, the Maekawara et al. reference clearly does not meet each and every limitation of the independent Claims 1, 8, and 38.

Claim 1 recites an optical write apparatus comprising, among other features, a plurality of substrates each having a number of light emitting diodes aligned in one direction,

wherein two substrates adjacent to each other in the aligning direction of the light emitting diodes are directly fixed to each other. Claim 8 recites an optical write apparatus comprising, among other features, a plurality of substrates each having a large number of light emitting diodes aligned in one direction, wherein two substrates adjacent to each other in the aligning direction of the light emitting diodes are directly fixed to each other. And Claim 38 recites an image forming apparatus comprising, among other features, an optical write apparatus that comprises a plurality of substrates each having a great number of light emitting diodes aligned in one direction, where every two substrates adjacent to each other in the aligning direction of the light emitting diode being directly fixed to each other. (See, e.g., Figure 6 and page 26, line 17, for support for the amendments.) The Applicant respectfully submits that the Maekawara et al. reference does not disclose all of the above limitations.

The Maekawara et al. reference depicts in Figures 26-28 a carriage (30) that holds and drives three heads (31, 32, 33) in a sub-scanning direction, where the heads (31, 32, 33) are kept at specified positions. On the heads (31, 32, 33) are provided a plurality of light emitting elements. As depicted in each of the figures, the heads (31, 32, 33) are all provided on the carriage (30) at positions displaced from one another about the drum.

The Applicant submits that the Maekawara et al. reference does not disclose two substrates adjacent to each other in an aligning direction of the light emitting diodes that are directly fixed to each other, as recited in Claims 1, 8, and 38 of the present application. The Maekawara et al. reference does not describe the specific structural configuration of the head (i.e. does not describe a substrate), however, it will be assumed for the sake of argument that the heads each include such a substrate. Thus, each individual head (31, 32, 33) and the substrate thereof are clearly attached to the carriage (30), and directly not to each other. In fact, the heads (31, 32, 33), and therefore also the substrates, are provided at locations far apart from each other. Thus, the Maekawara et al. reference does not disclose two substrates

that are directly fixed to each other, as expressly recited in Claims 1, 8, and 38 of the present application.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claims 1, 8, and 38.


Claim 44 is considered allowable for the reasons advanced for Claim 1 from which it depends. This claim is further considered allowable as it recites other features of the invention that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the applied references when those features are considered within the context of Claim 1.

New Claims 45-47 are believed to be in condition for allowance as they recite features that are not disclosed or suggested by the above reference. For example, the Maekawara et al. reference does not disclose an auxiliary member interposed between only two substrates, wherein two substrates adjacent to each other are fixed to each other, and connected by the auxiliary member. (Support for these claims can be found throughout the specification.) The Maekawara et al. reference depicts and describes a carriage (30) that is interposed between all three of the heads (31, 32, 33).

Consequently, in view of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Attorney of Record

Christopher D. Ward
Registration No. 41,367



22850

Customer Number 22850
Tel. (703) 413-3000
Fax. (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 10/01)

GJM:CDW:brf